IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

Faye Myrette-Crosley,

NO. C 11-05660 JW

Plaintiff, v.

ORDER DISCHARGING ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE; TERMINATING CASE

Mortg. Elec. Registration Sys., Inc., et al.,

Defendants.

On February 23, 2012, based on Plaintiff's prior multiple dismissals of Defendants in this action, the Court dismissed Plaintiff's claims against Defendants Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. ("MERS"), Clarion Mortgage Capital, Inc. ("Clarion"), MTC Financial dba Trustee Corps ("Trustee Corps"), Indymac Federal Bank, F.S.B. ("IndyMac") and OneWest Bank, F.S.B. ("OneWest"). (hereafter, "February 23 Order," Docket Item No. 29.) The Court also ordered Plaintiff to show cause as to why her claim against Defendant Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation ("Federal Home Loan") should not be dismissed. (See id.) Also on February 23, 2012, the Court received a Notice of Voluntary Dismissal in which Plaintiff voluntarily dismisses all claims against Defendants Federal Home Loan, MERS, and OneWest. (See Docket Item No. 28.)

In light of Plaintiff's dismissal of the only remaining Defendant in this case, Defendant Federal Home Loan, the Court DISCHARGES the Order to Show Cause as to Plaintiff's claim against Defendant Federal Home Loan and VACATES the hearing set for March 12, 2012. For the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For reasons discussed in the Court's February 23 Order, Plaintiff's claims as to Defendants OneWest and MERS were barred by res judicata.

reasons stated in the February 23 Order as to those Defendants that have been voluntarily dismissed by Plaintiff, the Court finds that Plaintiff's Notice of Voluntary Dismissal against Defendant Federal Home Loan is with prejudice, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41.<sup>2</sup>

No claims remain in this case. Judgment shall be entered accordingly.

Dated: February 23, 2012

United States District Chief Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> (<u>See</u> February 23 Order at 2-4 (describing procedural history of case and application of Rule 41 to Plaintiff's multiple dismissals).)

## For the Northern District of California

28

1	THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO		
2	Charles William Nunley charles.nunley@sierralawgroup.net Richard Joseph Reynolds rreynolds@trlawyers.com Timothy Lee McCandless tmvictorvillelaw@gmail.com William Guy Malcolm bill@mclaw.org		
3	Timothy Lee McCandless tmvictorvillel William Guy Malcolm bill@mclaw.org	gmail.com	
4	William Guy Malcolli oni e inclaw.org		
5	Dated: February 23, 2012	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk	
6		menura III III III III III III III III III I	
7		By: /s/ JW Chambers Susan Imbriani	
8		Courtroom Deputy	
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
$\sim$	II		